



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, DC 20530
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09 741,297	12 19 2000	Genevieve Hansen	S-300251D	5673

2284 7590 02 15 2002
SYNGENTA BIOTECHNOLOGY, INC.
PATENT DEPARTMENT
3054 CORNWALLIS ROAD
P.O. BOX 12257
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-2257

EXAMINER

KRUSE, DAVID H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1638

DATE MAILED 02 15 2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/741,297

Applicant(s)

HANSEN, GENEVIEVE

Examiner

David H Kruse

Art Unit

1638

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:
 - I. Claims 1-8, drawn to a method of transforming a plant cell under conditions, which inhibit *Agrobacterium*, induced necrosis (AIN), classified in class 800, subclass 294, for example.
 - II. Claim 9, drawn to a plant, plant tissue or plant cell comprising a nucleotide sequence of heterologous origin that inhibits AIN, classified in class 435, subclass 419, for example.
 - III. Claim 10, drawn to a plant culture medium, classified in class 435, subclass 431, for example.
 - IV. Claim 11, drawn to a method of transforming a plant cell comprising an *Agrobacterium* strain which does not induce significant levels of necrosis, classified in class 435, subclass 469, for example.
 - V. Claim 12, drawn to a method of determining the suitability of an *Agrobacterium* strain, classified in class 435, subclass 29, for example.
 - VI. Claim 13, drawn to a modified *Agrobacterium*, classified in class 435, subclass 252.2, for example.
 - VII. Claims 14-19, drawn to a method of transforming a plant cell comprising delivering to or expressing in said plant cell an antisense sequence, classified in class 800, subclass 286, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the plant, plant tissue or plant cell of Group II can be used in a materially different method than the method of transforming a plant cell of Group I, such as a method of producing delayed ripening fruit with insensitivity to ethylene.
3. Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the method of transforming a plant cell of Group I can be practiced using a materially different product than the culture medium of Group III, such as with the modified *Agrobacterium* of Group VI.
4. Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the method of

transforming of Group IV has different starting materials than the method of transforming of Group I.

5. Inventions I and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the method of selection of Group V has different starting materials and different method steps than the method of transforming of Group I.

6. Inventions I and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the modified *Agrobacterium* of Group VI can be used in a materially different method than the method of transforming of Group I, such as in a method of plasmid replication and isolation.

7. Inventions I and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the method of transforming of Group VII has different starting materials, different method steps and different end products than the method of transforming of Group I.

8. Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the modified plant, plant tissue or plant cell of Group II is structurally, compositionally and functionally distinct from the tissue culture medium of Group III.

9. Inventions II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the modified plant of Group II can be used in a materially different method than the method of transforming of Group IV, such as a method of producing delayed ripening fruit with insensitivity to ethylene.

10. Inventions II and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the modified plant of Group II cannot be used in the method of Group V.

11. Inventions II and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In

the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the modified plant is structurally, functionally and compositionally distinct from the modified *Agrobacterium* of Group VI.

12. Inventions II and VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the modified plant of Group II can be used in a materially different method than the method of transforming of Group VII, such as a method of producing delayed ripening fruit with insensitivity to ethylene.

13. Inventions III and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the method of transforming a plant cell of Group IV can be practice using a materially different product than the culture medium of Group III, such as with the modified *Agrobacterium* of Group VI.

14. Inventions III and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In

the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the culture medium of Group III cannot be used in the method of Group V.

15. Inventions III and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the culture medium of Group III is compositionally and functionally distinct from the modified *Agrobacterium* of Group VI.

16. Inventions III and VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the culture medium can be use in a materially different method than the transforming method of Group VII, such as the transforming method of either Group I or IV.

17. Inventions IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the method of transforming of Group IV has different starting materials, method steps and end products than the method of Group V.

18. Inventions IV and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the modified *Agrobacterium* of Group VI can be used in a materially different method than the method of transforming of Group IV, such as in a method of plasmid replication and isolation.

19. Inventions IV and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the method of transforming of Group IV has different starting materials, different method steps and different end products than the method of transforming of Group VII.

20. Inventions V and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the modified *Agrobacterium* of Group VI can be used in a materially different method than the method of determining the suitability of an *Agrobacterium* strain of Group V, such as in a method of plasmid replication and isolation.

Art Unit: 1638

21. Inventions V and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the method of Group V has different starting materials, different method steps and different end products than the method of transforming of Group VII.

22. Inventions VI and VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the modified *Agrobacterium* of Group VI can be used in a materially different method than the method of transforming of Group VII, such as in the method of transforming of Group I or Group IV.

23. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, subject matter and fields of search, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

24. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete within one month (not less than 30 days) must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR § 1.143).

25. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.48(b) if

Art Unit: 1638

one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 § CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR § 1.17(i).

26. The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1638. The second claims 14 submitted with the preliminary amendment of 19 December 2001 and claims 15-18 submitted with that amendment, have been renumbered as claims 15 and 16-19, respectively, in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.126.

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David H. Kruse, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 306-4539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Amy Nelson can be reached at (703) 306-3218. The fax telephone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306 Before Final or (703) 872-9307 After Final.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Kim Davis whose telephone number is (703) 305-3015.

David H. Kruse, Ph.D.
12 February 2002

1638
David H. Kruse